

III. Remarks

The status of the claims is set forth in the above listing of the claims. Claims 1-25, 27, 44-45, and 48 have been canceled without prejudice, and claims 26, 28-43, 46-47, and 49-50 remain pending in the present application. Although Applicant respectfully disagrees with the rejections and objections outlined in the Office Action, Applicant has amended claims 26, 28, 36-43, 46-47, and 49 and canceled claims 27, 44, and 48 to expedite the allowance of the present application.

IV. Arguments

A. Claim Rejections

Applicant notes that claims 47-50 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the claimed invention is allegedly directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 26-44 and 46-50 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement. Claims 26-32 and 34-50 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Published Patent Application No. 2003/0115366 to Robinson in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,510,429 to Todd.

1. 35 U.S.C. § 101 Rejections

Independent claim 47 was rejected because the claimed invention is allegedly directed to non-statutory subject matter. Although Applicant respectfully disagrees that the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter, independent claim 47 has been amended to additionally comprise “a processor” and “a memory element,” rendering the rejection moot. Claim 48 has been canceled. Claims 49-50 depend from independent claim 47. Since these claims further limit a patentably distinct independent claim, the dependent claims are allowable on that basis as well as based on the additional patentably distinct limitations that they provide.

2. 35 U.S.C. § 112 Rejections

Independent claim 26 was rejected as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement because the claim contains subject matter not described in the specification. Although applicants respectfully disagree that the claim contains subject matter not described in the specification, claim 26 has been amended and the language, “determining whether the at least one original destination is configured to receive the message” and “determining whether the at least one bridged destination is configured to receive the message” has been removed from independent claim 26, rendering the rejection moot. Independent claims 36 and 47 were similarly amended. Claims 27, 44, and 48 were canceled. Claims 28-35, 37-44, 46, and 48-50 dependent on one of independent claims 26, 36, and 47. Since these claims further limit a patentably distinct independent claim, the dependent claims are allowable on that basis as well as based on the additionally patentably distinct limitations that they provide.

3. 35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections

Independent claims 26, 36, and 47 were rejected as allegedly unpatentable over Robinson in view of Todd. Applicant respectfully submits that neither Robinson nor Todd teaches a system, method, or machine-readable medium which allows a message to be processed by both a first messaging paradigm and a second messaging paradigm. Robinson teaches a method for delivering message data in which the message “may be delivered and/or retrieved from [a] topic or [a] queue.”¹ The message is sent “to one of a queue and a topic,” but not to both.² Similarly, Todd teaches a message broker apparatus for receiving messages from a sender in which the message may either be sent to a queue manager or to a relational message broker, which bypasses the queue and sends the message to the subscriber.³ Independent claims 26, 36, and 47 allow for the message to be sent to both the original destination and the bridged destination.⁴ Applicant has amended independent claims 26, 36, and 47 to further emphasize this operability.

¹ See, *Robinson* Para. 15.

² *Id.*

³ See, *Todd* Fig. 1 and Col. 5 and 6.

⁴ See, e.g., Specification Para. 40-42 and Figures 3 and 4.

For at least the above reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 26, 37, and 47 are patentable over Robinson in view of Todd. Claims 27, 44, and 48 were canceled. Claims 28-32, 34-35, 37-46, and 48-50 depend on one of independent claims 27, 44, and 48. Since these claims further limit a patentably distinct independent claim, the dependent claims are allowable on that basis as well as based on the additional patentably distinct limitations that they provide.

For at least the above reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that the present application is in condition for allowance.

B. Specification

An objection was asserted in the Office Action for the specification allegedly failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. In particular, the specification allegedly failed to provide proper antecedent basis for the term “computer-readable medium.” Although Applicant respectfully disagrees that the specification failed to provide proper antecedent basis, Applicant respectfully submits that the pending claims have been amended to remove the term “computer-readable medium,” rendering the objection moot. Applicant also notes that, in a previous amendment to the specification, the phrase “carrier wave signals” was removed from paragraph 51. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the specification is in condition for allowance.

V. Summary of Examiner Interview

Pursuant to 37 CFR 1.133(b), Applicant provides the following written statement regarding the substance of the telephone interview conducted on March 11, 2009 among Examiner Strange and attorneys for Applicant Penny L. Lowry and Mackenzie M. DeWerff.

The interview commenced with a discussion of the claimed embodiments and then focused on the applicability of the cited references, particularly U.S. Published Patent

Application No. 2003/0115366 and U.S. Patent No. 6,510,429, to the patentability of the pending claims.

VI. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. If any additional fees are required to complete this filing, or if an overpayment has occurred, the Commissioner is authorized to charge or credit such amount to Deposit Account No. 13-0480, referencing Attorney Docket No. TIB-015. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned Attorney of Record if such would expedite the prosecution of this Application.

Respectfully submitted,

/Brian C. McCormack, Reg. No. 36,601/

Date: April 17, 2009

Brian C. McCormack
Registration No. 36,601
Attorney for Applicants
BAKER & MCKENZIE LLP
2300 Trammell Crow Center
2001 Ross Avenue
Dallas, TX 75201
Phone: 214-978-3007
Fax: 214-978-3099